

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,464	06/27/2003	Yasunao Katayama	JP920020119US1	9371
48813 7	7590 10/06/2006		EXAM	INER
LAW OFFICE OF IDO TUCHMAN (YOR)			ALPHONSE, FRITZ	
	82-70 BEVERLY ROAD KEW GARDENS, NY 11415		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	- -,		2133	
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,464	KATAYAMA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fritz Alphonse	2133	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica: - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a retion. It period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Poply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed or This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice up 	This action is non-final. allowance except for formal matt	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-10 and 12-24</u> is/are reject 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>3,4 and 11</u> is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2006 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the compact of t	are: a) \square accepted or b) \square object to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1, 3.	48) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 	

Application/Control Number: 10/608,464

Art Unit: 2133

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 5-9, 15, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori (U.S. Pat. No. 6,453,439) in view of Matsukuma (U.S. Pat. No. 5,905,741).

As to claims 1, 18 and 21, Hattori (fig. 4) discloses an encoding device for adding an error correction code parity to an input data sequence, including a first code encoding unit for adding a binary error correction code parity to each of a plurality of first data blocks into which the input data sequence is divided (col. 10, lines 10-31); and a second code encoding unit for adding a symbol error correction code for correcting an error by a symbol unit of a predetermined length to each of a plurality of second data blocks into which the input data

sequence is divided in a form different from that of the plurality of first data blocks (col. 10, lines 32-57).

Hattori differs from claim 1 in that he does not specifically disclose the number of bit errors to be corrected per total number of bits of the first data block to which the binary error correction code parity is added is larger than the number of bit errors to be corrected per total number of bits of the second data block to which the symbol error correction code parity is added.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Matsukuma discloses a data error correcting apparatus for digital signal frames, wherein the number of bits of a first data block to which binary error correction code parity is added is larger than the number of bit errors to be corrected per total number of bits of the second data block to which the symbol error correction code parity is added (col. 5 lines 50 through col. 6 line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hattori's device with data error correcting apparatus, as disclosed by Matsukuma. Doing so would provide an error correcting method and an error correcting apparatus for receiving digital information in mobile communication, which can shorten the time required for error correction processing.

As to claims 2, 5-6, Hattori discloses an encoding device, wherein the first code encoding unit adds, as the binary error correction code parity, a code having an error detection function for a larger number of bit errors than the number of bit errors to be corrected by the binary error correction code parity (col. 9, lines 55-65; col. 10, lines 10-31).

As to claims 7-9, Hattori (fig. 4) discloses a device, wherein the first code encoding unit adds, as the binary error code parity, a code having a burst error detection function to the first data block; and wherein the binary error correction code parity is capable of double-bit error correction (col. 10, lines 10-31).

As to claim 15, method claim 15 corresponds to apparatus claim 1; therefore, it is analyzed as previously discussed in claim 1 above.

4. Claims 10, 12 –14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamai (U.S. Pat. No. 5,856,890) in view of Matsukuma (U.S. Pat. No. 5,905,741).

As to claims 10 and 12, 19, 20, 22-24, Hamai (fig. 5) discloses decoding device for correcting errors of an encoded data sequence to which an error correction code parity is added, comprising: a storage unit for storing the encoded data sequence (col. 7, lines 49-57); a first error correction unit for correcting an error of each of a plurality of first data blocks, into which the encoded data sequence is divided, by minimum distance decoding of a binary error correction code (col. 6 lines 35-57); and a second error correction unit for correcting an error of each of a plurality of second data blocks, into which the encoded data sequence is divided in a form different from that of the plurality of first data blocks, by minimum distance decoding of a symbol error correction code for error correction by a symbol unit of a predetermined length (col. 6, lines 58 through col. 7 lines 19).

Hattori does not explicitly disclose a number of bit errors to be corrected by the binary error correction code is larger than the number of bit errors to be corrected by the symbol error

Art Unit: 2133

correction code. However, the limitations are obvious and very well known in the art, as evidenced by Matsukuma.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to improve upon the data error correcting apparatus, as disclosed by Matsukuma. Doing so would provide an error correcting method and an error correcting apparatus for receiving digital information in mobile communication, which can shorten the time required for error correction processing.

As to claims 13-14, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 10 and 12; therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 10 and 12 above.

As to claims 16-17, method claims 16-17 correspond to apparatus claim 10; therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claim 10 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-4 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/608,464

Art Unit: 2133

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Page 6

Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3813. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6:00, Alt. Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert De Cady, can be reached at (571) 272-3819.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3824.

Information regarding the status of an application may also be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 2133

September 29, 2006